

10th January 1950]

reported to the Government of Madras and whether the figures furnished in the statement placed on the table of the House were available to the Committee?"

THE HON. SRI B. GOPALA REDDI :—" It was only a forecast for the proposed Andhra Province and was naturally based on the accounts for 1948-49 and no adjustments were made either by the Partition Committee or the Government of Madras."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message from the Hon. the Speaker of the Madras Legislative Assembly, dated 9th January 1950 :—

' In accordance with rule 94 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly on the 9th January 1950, and signed by me for the concurrence of the Council '."

III.—MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

I have also to announce to the House that I have received the following messages from His Excellency the Governor of Madras, dated 10th December 1949 :—

' In pursuance of section 299, sub-section (3) of the Government of India Act, 1935, I, Krishna Kumarsinhji Bhavsinhji, Governor of Madras, hereby accord my previous sanction for the introduction of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949, in the Madras Legislative Council.

' In pursuance of section 82, sub-section (3) of the Government of India Act, 1935, I, Krishna Kumarsinhji Bhavsinhji, Governor of Madras, hereby recommend to the Madras Legislative Council the consideration of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949 '."

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS ESTATES (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) AMENDMENT BILL, 1949 (L.A. BILL NO. 1 OF 1950).

* **THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—**" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

' that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration at once.'

Sir, under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, as soon as an estate is notified the estate has to be surveyed and then settled in accordance with ryotwari

[Sri H. Sitarama Reddi] [10th January 1950]

principles and until these operations are completed, compensation cannot be paid to the claimants. The survey and settlement operations are expected to take some years and it is therefore considered desirable that provisions should be made for the payment of some portion of the compensation in advance at once, without waiting for the completion of these operations. The Bill makes provision accordingly. A rough estimate will be made of the compensation payable in respect of each estate as soon as it is notified and one-half of the amount as so estimated will be deposited as advance compensation in the office of the Tribunal within six months of the notified date. The advance compensation will be adjusted towards the compensation as finally determined under the Act. Annual interim payments will continue to be made as provided in section 50 of the Act but the amounts will be reduced by one-half, suitable adjustments being made when making the final reckoning.

“ Sir, it is also proposed to amend the Act so as to ensure the payment of a minimum sum of twelve and half crores of rupees as compensation for zamindari estates in the Province. According to this amendment, if after the amounts of compensation payable in respect of all zamindari estates have been finally determined, the aggregate of such amounts falls short of twelve and half crores of rupees, an amount equal to the sum by which the aggregate so falls short will be distributed among the estates *pro rata*.

“ The opportunity has been taken, Sir, to amend section 40 (2) of the Act so as to make the rules made under that section subject to the approval not only of the Legislative Assembly but also of this House. Hon. Members will remember that I gave an assurance to this effect when I moved the rules in last November before this House for its approval. This amendment also implements the assurance given on the floor of this House by the Revenue Minister then in charge on the 24th November 1948 that any rules framed under the Act would also come up before this House for consideration. I may tell you, Sir, that this amendment will not, however, affect the validity of any rules made before this Bill becomes law.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ The motion is—

‘ that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration at once ’..

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of an amendment that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee of this House as very serious amendments have been proposed in this Bill. It would appear that in this legislation—Abolition of Zamindaris—Government do not follow any policy or any principle nor are they consistent. Sir, after elaborate discussion in both the Houses only last year, the Government made provision for the payment of compensation to zamindars. In November last—I think on the 18th—the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue placed on the table of the House certain rules for payment of compensation to be framed by the Government under

10th January 1950] [Dr. V. K. John]

section 41 of the Act. Now it is said that the main Act was passed last year without knowing that there were difficulties in the way of the Government in fixing the compensation. I cannot understand, Sir, how this Government could not make a calculation or could only make a mis-calculation so early as in November last when rules were framed to which amendments are now brought forward. Now, there are two serious amendments

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition refer to rules to be amended by this Bill? ”

DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ The previous rules were made under section 41 of the Act and now this Bill gives the go by even to those rules.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think so.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ It does, Sir. Because the rules provide that if the basic annual sum in respect of the estate exceeds Rs. 3,000 but not Rs. 50,000 the compensation shall be paid in equal annual instalments not exceeding three in number and if the basic annual sum in respect of the estate exceeds Rs. 50,000 the compensation shall be paid in equal annual instalments not exceeding five in number. Now this present Bill provides that before June this year the Government shall have to pay down half of twelve and a half crores of rupees, in cash. This is different from what was contemplated in November last, that is, just two months ago.”

THE HON. SRI P. S. KUMARASWAMI RAJA :—“ It is for that reason—that is, because we want to pay that sum—this amending Bill has been brought forward.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ What I am suggesting is, Sir, two serious amendments are sought to be made now to this Act. It is a very important matter to consider whether this amount should be shelled out now by the Government when they have no money for nation-building activities. Whether it is for the provision of civic needs or for extension of education or for housing or, last but not least, for reclaiming lands and helping agriculturists under the Grow More Food campaign, Government plead want of funds. But what does this amending Bill provide? The Government must shell down Rs. 6½ crores. There is another curious thing about this Bill. I find a provision which goes to the very basic principle of the Act. According to this provision the Government will pay an aggregate sum of Rs. 12½ crores by way of compensation. This has to be paid without any account whatsoever and without any idea as to how much they must actually pay. I want to know from the Government whether they have any idea or they will be able to get any idea of the amount of compensation to be paid. Is it because they cannot even make a rough estimate that this 12½ crores of rupees has been provided? Again, Sir, what is the basis on which this figure has been arrived at? If this amending Bill is passed, the effect of it will be, the Government may have to pay, even if the compensation amounts to, say, Rs. 6½ crores as

[Dr. V. K. John] [10th January 1950]

per the main Act, over and above that an equal sum in order to make up the 12½ crores proposed now. Sir, this measure, first of all, began by expropriating the landholders, by telling them 'you are not landholders at all, you are just collectors of revenue only and so we can give you only so much.' Even then, we protested against enacting such an expropriatory measure. Now, the Government have come to the decision that not only the zamindars should be paid on the basis mentioned in the original Act but they will also be paid over and above that a sum which will constitute the difference between that sum and the proposed 12½ crores. As the Hon. the Minister has stated, it may be one and a half crores or it may go up to 5 or 6 crores of rupees. I ask, 'why should this be paid to the zamindars, why not it be paid for acquiring lands and why not the lands be sold to the agricultural labourers,' payment being arranged by the 'annuity' system. I strongly feel that if the final figure determined after survey and settlement is just equal to the payment to be made in June this year—that is, half of the aggregate amount contemplated by the Government—or more, no more money should be paid to the zamindars. Whether the zamindars are paid the value of the estate or have been over-paid, I feel Government should not come forward with another payment especially when they cannot easily find the money for it. This is what I am emphasizing. This important amendment should and ought to have been examined by a select committee. Sir, you are a lawyer yourself and you will find, if you go closely through this amendment, that many other sections of the original Act will require modification. Sir, when this fact was pointed out in the other House to the Hon. the Revenue Minister, he said 'we will bring in another amending Bill later on if there is need for it' . . ."

THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI:—"I never said anything like that."

* DR. V. K. JOHN:—"There is the report in *The Hindu* here. Perhaps it might have reported wrongly. But I find he has said like that. Sir, the Act was passed after discussion running to several days in the other House as well as this and certain rules were framed not even two months ago under that Act. Now another set of amendments is brought forward to those rules themselves which are very serious and therefore, deserve a good deal of scrutiny. And I feel that job can best be done by a select committee. I cannot understand why there should be this hurry-burry about it. If you pass this Bill in a haste again the Government may be compelled to come before this House with yet another amending Bill. So, Sir, these amendments, besides being serious in themselves, require consequential and incidental amendment of the other sections of the Act also. We must go through them and only a select committee can go through them. If they think that this Bill can be passed by the Congress Legislature Party and then it can be passed in the Legislature because they have a majority in this House and the other House, then it is different. The usefulness of this House is at stake. We are not going through

10th January 1950] [Dr. V. K. John]

a farce of a discussion. I have given notice that this matter stand adjourned under rule 63. Now I am on the select committee question. If you, Mr. President, will allow me I will speak on the motion for the postponement of the consideration of the Bill also. This Bill is being rushed through. Late in the evening yesterday, this was passed in the Assembly. This is a Bill which will commit the Government to a payment of Rs. 6½ crores in another six months, when we have no money at all. It will commit the Government to pay the zamindars more than what was provided in the original Bill, as if there are no other classes of people except the zamindars who ought to be benefited. It is a very serious matter and it should be examined by the select committee. It will help the Government. Why should the Government hurry through it? In spite of days being spent in the discussion of the original Bill in the Assembly and the Council, the Government have had to come forward with this amending Bill before anything is done under the Act. That means that they are rushing through things, they are not consistent, they have no ideas and no principles. The other day I was reading a book, for which the Government have spent a lot of money in printing. It is a book called 'Three Years Work of the Madras Ministry.' (An hon. Member: 'It is a party publication.') Whoever has published it, it is public money wasted. One of the achievements of the Congress Party is said to be the Zamindari Abolition Bill. I say, Sir, that from every point of view, it is a record of failure of the Government to act on some principle, on some policy and with consistency even if they adopted a wrong policy. They have no consistency at all, they are rushing through everything because they have got a majority. I ask my friends on the other side whether they have understood this Bill. Even a very trained lawyer going through this amendment will take hours and hours to understand the import and the meaning of these amendments."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I may just inform hon. Members that I waived notice for this for the following reasons. First of all there was some uncertainty about the continuance of this Council. This Bill had gone through the other House and has to be passed by us. The Government did not want it to be left unfinished at this stage. That is one of the main reasons. Secondly I thought that the Bill having been published long ago in the Government Gazette and no amendments having been made in the other House, there can be no difficulty in considering the Bill here. I thought the House would not be at a disadvantage in taking it up to-day. Another reason is this. On the 7th, when we were rising, I informed the House that this Bill was likely to come before this House to-day and that this House was going to be adjourned to this day just for the purpose of this Bill. I requested hon. Members to be ready with this Bill. For these three reasons I thought I was justified in waiving notice. I am giving these reasons for the information of the hon. Members."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" We had no idea that no amendments would be made in the other House. Perhaps you are in a better

[Dr. V. K. John] [10th January 1950]

position than the Members of the Opposition to know whether amendments would be made in the other House or not. But the Bill was passed by the other House only late in the evening yesterday and I do not see any reason why it should be rushed through. There may have been some reasons on the 7th, but much water has flown down the bridges since the 7th. I find that many of the Hon. Ministers are pleased that the Andhra Province is not coming into existence on the 26th."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I hope the hon. Member is not questioning my discretion in waiving notice. My discretion has been exercised. The hon. Member's discretion is there. He may move his amendments or not as he pleases. I have told the House what prompted me to waive notice."

DR. V. K. JOHN:—"That is quite true, Sir. We have always been happy that you do what you think proper in the interests of the House."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I knew that such an objection would be raised and I took care about it."

DR. V. K. JOHN:—"We are now in different circumstances altogether. We then thought that this House would be extinguished."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I do not know whether the matter is so clear now. The position is in a fluid state and we do not know what will happen."

* DR. V. K. JOHN:—"Everything is in a fluid state. But, Sir, you are the custodian of the usefulness of the House—I do not say of the dignity and prestige of the House—and I ask you why should we rush through this important piece of legislation without having that examined by a select committee? In that select committee the Government will have a majority."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"I am not saying anything against the motion. It is not for me to say whether a select committee should be appointed or not."

* DR. V. K. JOHN:—"At the same time, under certain conditions you agreed to have this Bill discussed. According to the rules, three days' notice should be given for amendments. I have given notice of some amendments. How is this House useful unless we are given sufficient and reasonable time to go into a paper that reaches us this morning at 10 o'clock by post?"

MR. PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may adduce these arguments when he moves his adjournment motion. Now he is on the question of a select committee."

* DR. V. K. JOHN:—"Let us have this Bill examined by a select committee. Otherwise I am quite sure that within a short time, in another two months, the Government will bring forward another Bill saying, 'We have hustled this through. Now we find

10th January 1950] [Dr. V. K. John]

it is unworkable.' How did that Bill become unworkable? It was discussed threadbare. Why did it become unworkable within a short time? Why did the Government change their opinion so soon? When they introduced the draft rules in November, they had one opinion and within one month they have changed their opinion. I think that this kind of hustling through legislation pays no respect to the Upper House. In a democratic form of Government, the executive has to respect the legislature and the judiciary. How do they respect the legislature in hustling through this Bill? They should have taken the Bill to a select committee in the other House. The rules provide that if the Bill has not gone through a select committee of the other House, it may go through a select committee of this House. Nothing will be lost by having this matter examined by a select committee. It can be done in a day or two days. What is the effect of the amendment on the main Bill, on the public revenues and no other classes of people besides the zamindars? Let us consider all that calmly. If the Government are wise, they would accept my motion for a select committee in which they can put eminent members on the other side."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" And on which the hon. Member will refuse to work."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" I have very little time to serve on a select committee. There are hon. Members on this side who will do better than myself in a select committee. They will find time to serve on it. I am sorry I have not been able to serve on any select committee though I have been requested many times. I do not mind the members of the Government party themselves forming the select committee. The whip is a barrister. But let us have a feeling that this is not a farce, that something is passed through the other house and it comes here, no notice is given to the members and within a few hours it is passed by a majority here. Sir, some of us were quite happy that this Council was going to be scrapped, because we have a poignant feeling that after all no useful purpose is served by the Council and that it is a farce and things are rushed through. The Government have a majority, but let them respect the legislature and make it useful in the public eye. At least let them go through the forms. I ask the Hon. Minister for Revenue, if he does not stand on false prestige, to accept my motion that the Bill be referred to a select committee of this House."

DR. SYED TAJUDIN :—" I second the motion."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

' that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949, be referred to a select committee "."

* THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—" Sir, I cannot accept the motion. I oppose it. I have heard very carefully the speech of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I am surprised that he should have made those remarks. I know, Sir, he is very

[Sri H. Sitarama Reddi] [10th January 1950]

consistent. He is consistent in opposing anything that comes from the Government. He can certainly claim consistency for that. I do not grudge it. He charged the Government with having no principles. I do not know what kind of principle he refers to. If it is the principle of opposing things for mere opposition's sake, we do not do it. That is not our principle.

"Sir, let me come to the point that has been raised by the hon. Member. I am surprised that he should say that very serious amendments have been proposed and that Government have changed their mind within two months after passing certain rules under section 40. May I ask the hon. Member who is a lawyer to go through the rules that were passed under section 40 in November? They were rules which gave an indication of the manner and method of payment of compensation and other things. The amendments that are now proposed are in pursuance of certain undertakings given on the floor of this House and the other House. I may just recall to his mind certain portions of the speech of the then Hon. Revenue Minister Mr. Kala Venkata Rao when the Leader of the Opposition interjected, 'What about the opinion of the Advocate-General of India?' The then Revenue Minister gave an estimate of Rs. 12½ crores. In the course of his speech he said that the Government proposed to pay Rs. 12½ crores as compensation. The question of payment of Rs. 12½ crores as compensation has come repeatedly before this House when the Bill was being considered and also before the other House and the Joint Select Committee. So the question is nothing new either to the Members of this House or the other House."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—"It was Rs. 17½ crores when the matter was discussed and not Rs 12½ crores."

* THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—"I should only like the hon. Member to go through the official proceedings which I have got here and which speak of Rs. 12½ crores. The amendment now only seeks to give effect to the assurance that was given on the floor of the House. In pursuance of that assurance, if the amount falls short of Rs. 12½ crores, the Government propose to pay the zamindars Rs. 12½ crores *pro rata*. That is the amendment."

3-30
p.m.

"The second amendment that is given here is also in pursuance of an assurance given to this Honourable House that in future when an amending Bill was brought forward, the lacuna in the Act that the Council had no powers to expect the rules made under the Act being brought forward before this House would be made up. The third amendment that is sought to be brought forward now is with regard to the question of payment of 50 per cent of compensation, on a rough estimate, as advance payment. There are also some other clauses which are consequential on these three basic principles of this amending Bill. Sir, the hon. Member raised the question that Government had no money and how did they propose to pay. Sir, I am prepared to answer that point. The Government propose to release some of the securities

10th January 1950]

[Sri H. Sitarama Reddi]

for payment of advance compensation to such of the estates as have already been taken over; and as regards the question of taking over other estates, it will be so regulated that they will be notified as and when the Government are in a position to pay the advance compensation as contemplated under the provisions of this Bill. That is how the Government propose to find the necessary money, and that aspect of it has been thoroughly examined not only in consultation with Finance department but also in consultation with the Government of India; and it is only in accordance with the views of the Finance department and of the Government of India that this legislation has now been brought forward.

"Sir, then the hon. Member also referred to my having promised to bring in an amending Bill; most probably he was referring to the reply I made to a charge made by one of the hon. Members in the other House that the Government were bringing in lots of amending Bills. I gave the assurance in that House that the Government would bring in amending Bills if they were necessary to do justice to the people. There is nothing wrong in bringing forward an amending Bill, and there is nothing wrong if that Bill is brought forward to do justice to the people. That is the only principle involved and there is nothing serious going to happen.

"Then the question was raised that the matter was thrust upon the House suddenly. You have rightly remarked, Sir, that this Bill was published long ago in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the other hon. Members who are very diligent readers of the Government publications, would have read this Bill and certainly scrutinized it. I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition being a very studious lawyer, would have gone through that Bill received along with the official Gazette, and I say he cannot plead lack of notice."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—"I must have at least 24 hours."

THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—"That is why, Sir, I oppose this reference to a Select Committee; there is nothing here to go before a Select Committee; the principles are simple and there is nothing complicated about them. That is why I oppose the motion for reference to a Select Committee."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"My friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition thought I would speak after you have put the motion. Anyhow, I think I can speak on the general principles of the Bill now."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"If you are speaking on the motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, that can be disposed of first; and then we shall take up the general aspects of the Bill."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"My hon. friend, the Minister for Land Revenue twitted my Leader by saying that

[Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

[10th January 1950]

he was in receipt of the *Fort St. George Gazette* and as the Bill was published sometime ago in the Gazette, he must have had an opportunity of perusing the various clauses of the Bill. But may I remind my hon. friend the Revenue Minister that we are dealing with a Bill as sent up by the Legislative Assembly? My friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, could not anticipate that the Assembly would pass the Bill as presented by the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue. I think he is perfectly justified in saying that he had not enough time and that this House should be given every opportunity to examine the various provisions of the Bill in detail by referring it to the Select Committee. We do not at all question your discretion, Sir, in waiving notice for this Bill, but in the view of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, various amendments have been introduced in this Bill, though the Bill appears to be innocuous. As a lawyer, he finds that this Bill introduces various principles which were not contemplated when the Bill was first introduced in this House. On the question of Rs. 12½ crores, I too was wondering how even the previous Minister for Land Revenue arrived at this figure."

MR. PRESIDENT:—"This motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee is only by way of amendment to the main motion. So, I think you can go on even by way of general discussion. In that view, I think you can move the adjournment motion also."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO:—"Unfortunately, Sir, as you are aware, the Members of the Opposition refused to take part in the later stages of the discussion on the Zamindari Abolition Bill owing to a hitch we had with the then Revenue Minister. Even then, if we were here, we would have asked hon. Revenue Minister to tell us—and perhaps others here asked him—how he arrived at the Rs. 12½ crores, on what basis he arrived at that figure. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said: 'What is this approximate figure of Rs. 12½ crores, how did you arrive at it'. He put that question because the Government want to give half of it immediately. That is the only point now, and there is nothing wrong in his asking for that information. I think the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue need not have felt so much offended at his asking for that piece of information. We all of us repeat and ask, how did you arrive at this Rs. 12½ crores. As a matter of fact, the Government themselves feel that the estimate may be wrong and they have also inserted a proviso to the effect that if it is to be more, they will distribute the extra *pro rata*. That shows they are really not sure of their estimate of it. There is also another provision which the Minister for Land Revenue read from the Statement of Objects and Reasons in introducing this Bill. The first sentence runs like this: 'Under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, as soon as estate is notified, the estate has to be surveyed and then settled in accordance with ryotwari principles and until these operations are completed, compensation cannot be paid to the

10th January 1950] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

claimants'. Sir, the survey and settlement operations are expected to take some years. Was not the then Revenue Minister aware that always these survey and settlement operations generally take some years? Why was it not thought of? That is because we lack administrative experience, and we do not take the advice of those who have administrative experience. Do you mean to say the Secretariat would not have pointed out that it would be difficult to complete survey and settlement operations in a few months and that it would take a large number of years? This amendment is intended to rectify a mistake which they have now found out. They ought to have found it out long ago, and this provision that they want now, to give half-compensation, should have been made in the original Bill itself. The fact of the matter is that this Government did not want it give any compensation at all to the zamindars till the survey and settlement operations were completed; and it is because they are forced now by circumstances to give this half-compensation that this Bill is being brought forward. I know the Government say that their sense of equity and justice has made them change their opinion and they want to go to the help of these zamindars, some of whom might have said they were starving. But why not say that? Or they can say 'we find now that the Government of India want us not to leave these zamindars in the lurch and they want us to go to their assistance'.

"Another fact which I want to mention is that at the time this Bill came up first, when the then Revenue Minister moved this, I was one of those who questioned him to show us how he would find the money for this compensation; I was one of those who protested strongly that this Government had no business to touch the Revenue reserves for the purpose of liquidating the zamindars. The Revenue reserves have been built up for the purpose of undertaking schemes for the economic uplift of the whole Province. But here it is now contended perhaps that this Abolition of Zamindaris Act and the releasing of the tenants from the clutches of the zamindars is one of the measures of economic development of the country and so the Revenue reserves can be utilized for this purpose—that perhaps must be the argument. Supposing that the survey and settlement operations are not completed for two years more and the Government of India put pressure, or the zamindars themselves put pressure on this Government, then the Government perhaps will come forward and say 'we are willing to pay the full compensation out of the Revenue Reserve Fund'. The Revenue Reserve Fund has been built up by some people and we shall not waste it in this manner. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, suggested the collection of some amount from those who will be benefited by this legislation. Sir, everybody seems to be touchy about that question; they are prepared to ask the poor pattadar to give double the land revenue that he is paying and treat half of it as loan for the purpose of using it for development purposes; but so far as the zamindari tenant is concerned, he is to them a God, he should not be touched. I do not know why so much concern there is for the zamindari

[Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao] [10th January 1950]

tenant alone and not for the poor ryotwari tenant. We are unable to appreciate this. The zamindari tenant is going to get valuable rights; are not tenants under all zamindars in every part of the country being made to pay something towards the acquisition of those rights? Why should the general taxpayer's money be used for the purpose of acquiring rights for a particular class of people who are themselves capable of acquiring those rights by paying that compensation—that is my point. And my point is strengthened by the fact that most of the ryots who are getting this right are not actual cultivators. I challenged the Hon. Revenue Minister to give me the figures of people who will be actual cultivators who will be benefited by this Zamindari Abolition Act. He was not able to do so; and yet he twitted us, as he is an adept in doing that; because he had no figures. If at least the actual cultivator who has been rackrented for so many years now is to be benefited, there may be some justification for putting our hands into the Revenue Reserves and releasing the tenants from the clutches of the zamindars; but it is the middlemen who have been the rent collectors who will be benefited by this legislation. It is true they are the most influential people in exercising votes. Is it for the purpose of pleasing this class of people who have political power in their hands that you are going to use the Revenue Reserves and also to satisfy the zamindars who have been clamouring that you are going to deprive them of their estates without compensation? Sir, it is not fair. At the time of the passing of the Zamindari Abolition Act, we warned that the people who were proceeding with the legislation were not anticipating the difficulties they would come across. The very difficulties which we pointed then are being encountered by the Government to-day, and this Bill itself is a glaring instance of that.

“ Sir, I wish the Hon. Revenue Minister had agreed to refer this Bill to Select Committee. After all, what is the object of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition? It is to examine whether there are any other lacunae in the piece of legislation that is now introduced and to set them right. I have rarely served on a Select Committee, Sir; but my experience in the Select Committee on the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill tells me that if people properly apply themselves to the task entrusted to them, a great deal of good can be done in the Select Committee stage by pointing out and rectifying certain defect which might have escaped the attention of the draftsmen. The object of my friend is to see whether there are any other provisions inconsistent with the provisions now introduced or with the existing provisions which can be set right. That is the purpose why my hon. friend wanted to introduce this motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

3-45
p.m.

“ Then there is one point about which I have given notice of an amendment to which I would refer. Some zamindars—I do not say most of the zamindars—are indebted to others. Is it

10th January 1950] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

not the intention of the Government that when this compensation is given—whether it is half or one-fourth or full it does not matter—that the creditors should be paid full for the amounts they have advanced to the zamindars? Should it not be a first charge, at least next to pishkush and other dues to the Government, because it is a contract between the zamindar and the creditor and because he had the property he believed that the zamindar would be exercising his unrestricted rights regarding alienation, mortgage and other rights over the property. In cases where the creditor has advanced money to the zamindar—some of them may be impecunious, but it is not our concern, should he not get his money back, at least what he has paid, especially when the zamindar gets his compensation? Is he to be treated along with other maintenance holders or under-tenure holders and be given only half? It is not fair to the creditors who went to the help of these zamindars. The creditor believed that the zamindar had absolute rights in the property and it is not fair that he should be treated in this manner.

“ I find that it is the tribunal that has to decide. This is only a common transaction between the borrower and the lender. In such a case, how can you oust the jurisdiction of the courts and invest it in the tribunal? With the help of my hon. Friend, Dr. John, all these points could have been set right in the Select Committee. Let it consist of only lawyers who know to argue both sides of a case. Let them set right matters so that the interests of all concerned may be preserved and no injustice is done to any one so that the zamindar may be enabled to enjoy half compensation that is paid to him at least without further troubles from these creditors and others. With these few words, I support the motion for reference to Select Committee.”

* SRI A. GOVINDACHARYULU :—“ Sir, I was really surprised to hear my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayana Rao and his arguments. I was one of the members on the Zamindari Bill Select Committee and this Bill was discussed and discussed for days and days together not only in Madras at the Select Committee but in Delhi also by the High Command. I think no other Bill than this was discussed so clearly and in detail by so many people including many experts. I was one of those people who fought tooth and nail against some of its clauses and I dare say that the zamindars have now got what they actually wanted at the time of the Select Committee. In the Select Committee the zamindari representatives in thier evidence, as well as many members of the Select Committee wanted some compensation to be paid in advance and they wanted us to see that the 12½ crores compensation should be worked out and that it should not be less than that in any way in working out the details and the rules thereof. That is all that the zamindars wanted. Now I must congratulate the present Revenue Minister for his boldness and courage in bringing forward this amending Bill. We really wanted then, not on behalf of the zamindars but on behalf of justice and equity that some compensation should be given in

[Sri A. Govindacharyulu] [10th January 1950]

advance, because the Congress stood for co-operative commonwealth and not for expropriation of properties and rights of people. We want good distribution of wealth among all classes of people and so the Zamindari Act has come. Somebody said that this is Zamindari Acquisition Act and not abolition Act. We need not worry about the word acquisition or abolition. Whatever it is, the question is that the zamindars from whom we are taking the property should be paid and that they should be paid adequate also.

"Another point raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayana Rao, is what right has the Government got to pay the Zamindars from the general revenues of the Government. I may tell him that because the Government has been now acquiring the revenues that are now being paid to the zamindars from the zamindari ryot. The revenue will hereafter be paid directly to the Government revenues by the zamindari ryot. So, now when the Government will be acquiring the revenue from the zamindari ryot, the Government should pay compensation to zamindars from the revenues of the Government.

"My hon. Friend raised another point. That is, it is the middleman that is being benefited. In the ryotwari area, also the middleman is the proprietor and the actual cultivator of the tiller of the soil is not the proprietor to-day. Whether you call it socialism or anything else, since Congress stands for the principle of co-operative commonwealth, we do not think of the abolition of property rights as they stand to-day. We only want to elevate the ryot from rack-renting and so on. That is all which the Congress stands for. There may be certain defects in the Zamindari Act, but they are now sought to be rectified by this amending Bill so far as the zamindars are concerned. I would have been glad if the Hon. the Revenue Minister brought in certain other amendments also for which we fought, particularly the question of restoring the rights of the judiciary over the question of payment of compensation and other things. In the Zamindari Act, if I remember aright, so far as the powers of the High Court were concerned, they were removed, that is, to sit in judgment over the decision of Tribunals. If this also is restored, I think the Act will be a perfect one and if it is done, of course, it will be a welcome thing. The hon. Members on the Opposition said that when it was less compensation that was proposed they wanted more and when it is proposed to give what the zamindars wanted they now say that much has to be paid. And when we say that the Government should pay it, they say that the ryots should be made to pay. That is all. They always try to speak something which is not good. They must have something to say on important Bills like this. So, there is no point whatsoever about the objections raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayana Rao. I whole-heartedly support the Bill and I hope further amendments also will shortly be placed before this House in regard to the judiciary and other defects which we have shown at the time of the discussions over the original Bill."

The amendment was put and lost.

10th January 1950]

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Sir, I move under rule 63 that the discussion of this Bill be adjourned or postponed to another date... I do not want to make any speech on this, because I have already mentioned why we should not be hustled in this manner. Moreover, this Bill was passed only yesterday in the other House and it came into our hands only at 10 o'clock to-day. Most of us are busy with other matters also and so we have no time to study this complicated Bill. There are also amendments to it and they have to be studied. Therefore, we must be given sufficient time to consider all the aspects of the Bill.

“ Again, Sir, the Ministers seem to forget what happened a year ago, in November 1948, when we were discussing the original Bill. The then Hon. Revenue Minister said at the time that the total compensation payable under the Act would be about 17 crores. Here I have got a copy of the speech he made, but to-day his successor says, it is only 12½ crores. Perhaps the idea struck him just two months back or just a few days ago”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ He referred to the speech of Mr. Kala Venkata Rao made when he introduced the Bill.”

DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ It is 12 plus 5, 17 crores. I think, Sir, they are not omitting the inams from this compensation, because everything is there.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ Anyhow the amount has come down.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ This 12½ crores, is it merely for the zamindars or for the inamdars also, or is it for both? I hope the Hon. Minister has to say that. However, that is only by the way. They forget what has happened. I say, give us some little time, whatever might have been the position a few days ago you thought that under the conditions then existing you might get through this Bill to-day, although it might have been passed yesterday by the Assembly, I say now the conditions have changed and we are sitting. I do not see why they should rush through this Bill. Let us have time. Last time we non-co-operated with the further discussion of this Bill at a particular stage on the ground that the usefulness of this House, the dignity and the prestige of the House were taken away by section 40, according to which the rules will be passed by the Assembly and not by the Council. Then we non-co-operated and walked out. The Hon. Minister then said that he would bring in an amendment, although he would not agree to the amendment then, though they could have done it, because it was a matter of prestige and that we are only a post-office and no amendment could be passed in this House, the reason being, if any amendment is passed here, they must go back before the other House. Sir, the very history of this Congress Government during the last three years is, that not one amendment suggested by us has been allowed as an amendment when any Bill was discussed, but later on they accepted our suggestions and brought

[Dr. V. K. John]

[10th January 1950]

forward amending Bills in respect of them. So, Sir, even though they would take the trouble of bringing in amending Bills, they would not allow any amendments in this House, thereby telling us in plain language, look here, this is a post-office, you can shout and talk as you like, but we can, by a majority, pass this Bill through. Sir, I ask, is it in keeping with the dignity of this House that such an attitude should be shown by the Government time after time, section after section? They now say, we want to amend the Bill, the Council must be consulted but they would not agree to any particular amendment, though they could have easily accepted such an amendment even then. To-day, if the attitude of the Government is the same, namely, that this House is merely a post-office, there is some shouting going on, there is some speech-making and waste of time, it does not matter, we shall have the Bill passed in the Assembly and passed in this House whatever may be the reasonableness of the amendments, we would not have any amendments in this Council. I say, it is much better, more dignified and more in keeping with our self-respect that we take no part as such in the proceedings of the Council. If that is the attitude of the Government and the party that supports them, it is a very serious matter. I do not see any reason why this should be rushed through. The other day, we suggested that the resolution regarding the High Court might be taken up on another day that is to-day. But the Government said that they wanted to communicate the resolution to the Government of India and we co-operated with them and even regarding the adjournment motion though we had a good case in that the Government did not stick to their original undertaking to consult the House before they made any recommendations to the Government regarding the partition question. I cut short my observations as the Leader of the House explained the circumstances. We always co-operate with the Government. The Upper House is a dignified body and not always in opposition to Governmental measures. How many times have we supported the Government in the interests of the public? But when they bring in measures not in the interests of the public, we must have freedom to say boldly and without fear or favour that the Government are wrong and they should correct themselves. Why should not we be given the opportunity to make this House a useful forum for discussion of Bills: are we to be merely a post-office and are we to waste our time in merely talking and talking over all Bills? What after all is the ground to rush through this Bill without giving Members time to consider the Bill and the nature of the amendments they must give in respect of the Bill? A motion under rule 63, would enable us to have time in which to study the Bill, its implications, and the manner in which it could be improved and the amendments to be moved for that purpose. I am sure hon. members of the House had no time to move any amendments to the Bill. Sir, you are the protector of the usefulness of the House—I would not say the prestige and dignity of the House; let us not be hustled. That will afford an opportunity for us to give suggestions to the Hon. Minister though he may not accept them. Though he may not accept them on the floor of the House, he

10th January 1950]

[Dr. V. K. John]

might bring another Bill after some time. Sir, you would remember that amending Bills have been brought in based on the suggestions made in the House and I myself have been complimented on several occasions on being responsible for the suggestions embodied in such Bills. Although this House might not exist after some time, we have a right to ask the Government to allow us opportunities so long as we exist to study the Bills before us and do our duty to the public. Nobody would mourn and I for one will never mourn the extinction of this House having regard to the way this House has been treated by the Government on several occasions. I would only think it is so much of time saved for me which I could devote to something more useful. It is now four o'clock and I have many amendments and am I to be hushed by being allowed two minutes for each amendment to enable the Government to pass the Bill? If that is the idea, it is much better not to move amendments not to take part in the discussion of the Bill and allow the Government to have their own way because they have a majority. This should not be the case and I protest against the way in which without any necessity whatsoever the Government want to rush through this measure."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, I second the motion."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I am not inclined to cut down the hon. Member's speech on his amendments."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" I may not move them at all, Sir."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The motion is that under rule 63, the consideration of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949, be postponed to another date."

THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—" Mr. President, Sir, let me first assure hon. Members that the Government do not treat this House as a post-office. They do not have any such intention nor did they have such intention at any time; we know the value of the advice that we get from the Members of this House and the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that we have very great respect for the views of the Members of this House and he himself did say that the Government sometimes accepted his advice and came forward later on with amendments. I should like to take this opportunity of assuring him that no such idea lies behind the mind of the Government to disrespect this House or any member of the House. I do not see any reason why the hon. Leader of the Opposition should feel so hurt about this matter. As I have already said, we have brought forward the amendments in pursuance of the assurances we have already given and there is no question of rushing through any legislation in this House as I am not bringing any new principles to be incorporated in the Bill; these are all things discussed threadbare on the floor of this House and this is only to implement what was discussed at great length before. I do not think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would press his motion for postponement but he would enable the Government to go through this Bill to-day."

[10th January 1950]

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ The question is that the consideration of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949, be postponed to another date.”

The motion was lost.

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Mr. President, I think I have an opportunity to speak on the general principles of the Bill. Let me take the sentence in the Statement of Objects and Reasons to the effect that the survey and settlement operations will take some years and that it is, therefore, considered desirable that some provision should be made for payment of some portion of the compensation in advance at once without waiting for the completion of these operations. I want to tell the House and through the House the public of Madras how the Government of Madras last year thought differently then but within one year they found out they could not do it but that that would take some years. When did they discover that they would take many years; is this a Government who have no officers, no equipment and no means to find out last year itself that it would take some years? I say, Sir, that the reason given here is not the correct reason at all, the real reason being that they have been asked as I see from certain discussions which took place in the other House, by certain highly placed persons in the Government of India to pay half of the compensation now. Why cannot they state that certain Congress leaders have asked them to do it and therefore, they are amending the Bill? Is it creditable for any Government, who claim to be an efficient Government, to say within a year after the main enactment had been passed, that they had found out that it would take many years to complete the survey and settlement operations? Last year, the then Revenue Minister said that the compensation involved would be 17 crores but now the figure of 12½ crores has been mentioned. How did he make this assessment; what have they done before arriving at this estimate; have they gone through any records? How did the figure come down from 17 crores to 12½ crores of rupees? Is it that some agreement was reached by which the zamindars said that they would take twelve and a half crores? I ask why was it not possible for them to honestly take this House and the other House into confidence and tell them and the public that they had come to some agreement with the representatives of the zamindars under the advice given by leaders in Delhi that the zamindars should be given that amount and why should this scant courtesy be shown to the Houses of Legislature by telling them something which is not true? There is a provision by which, if on the basis of the original Act the amount is not Rs. 12½ crores but less but still, the zamindars will be paid that amount which is in excess of the actual amount. At the time the original Act was passed and when the basis of compensation was under discussion, there were speeches made in the House to the effect that the zamindars were not really the proprietors of the soil and they lost nothing by the zamindaris being taken over and so they should not be paid any sort of compensation at all. Then the Legislature fixed the basis of compensation and both the Houses passed it and it became law and now the

10th January 1950] [Dr. V. K. John]

Hon. the Minister tells us that he wants an amending Act under which although on the basis fixed under the original Act, the compensation would be less than 12½ crores—it may be eight, six or four crores of rupees—yet the excess over that amount to make up the 12½ crores of rupees will be paid. I ask, 'Sir, why not the Minister tell us.' I expect that the amount on the basis originally fixed will be eleven crores and we wish to pay them 12½ crores all the same but 6½ crores now? Can the Government say that they would pay them much more than they deserve on the basis of the compensation fixed by both the Houses in the Bill which was passed by them? What is the answer of the Government? Would it be creditable to any Government to say that we fix such and such a sum as compensation to be paid now, on rough and ready method, for which there is no basis? And then Government say, at the end of the survey and settlement operations if there is anything to be paid to them, they will pay them then. Now, Sir, is it a gift of public money to be paid to the zamindars? Government have passed a Bill before, under which they have fixed a compensation on some basis. Let them follow that basis. If according to that only six crores are to be paid, I do not know why public revenue should be depleted by another six and a half crores. Let them remember that according to them—and that is Mr. Kala Venkata Rao said when he introduced the Bill—the zamindars are not proprietors of the soil to be entitled to any full compensation but are only collectors of revenue. If Government want to spend this 6½ crores, are there not landless agricultural labourers among whom it can be distributed? Are they not our kith and kin? The other day I said that there are two enemies to the peace, prosperity and good order in this Province. One is the Communists with their subversive activities and the other the Government who plough the field for the Communists. Cannot Government look to the welfare of the poor tiller of the soil and distribute these few crores among them? Sir, is this a popular Government representing the people of this Province? I ask, why this solicitude for the zamindar to pay him 6½ crores now and the balance, if any, afterwards? The real truth is the Hon Minister wants to hide the fact that Government have come to an agreement with the zamindars that the latter should take 12½ crores, whatever the basis of compensation may be! Sir, I cannot understand this arrangement. Why did not Government bring in the original Bill itself this advance payment of compensation? Sir, I have never heard of any Government bringing an amending Bill for payment of advance payment of compensation. If Government want to pay zamindars something more than what was intended to be paid them in the original Bill, let them say so. But have they said anywhere the reason for this? Have they said the reason in this House? Have they said the reason in the other House; or have they said it from the public platform? No, they have not said it anywhere. Sir, when discussing the original Bill they have decided that the zamindars should not be paid full compensation; and they have fixed the compensation on some specific basis even at that stage. Let them stick to that basis. I have never heard

4-15
P.m.

[Dr. V. K. John] [10th January 1950]

of any legislature going back on its previous decision in this manner—Sir, my hon. Friends on the other side, or rather, as per the direction of the Speaker in the other House, I should say, the hon. Gentlemen on the other side”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ You may say, ‘ hon. Friends on the other side ’.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ My hon. Friends on the other side will vote for the passing of this Bill; but in doing so, let them care for their political future. Let them remember that the Bill they now seek to pass has no policy or principle behind it. What is the reason given by them for giving 12½ crores. According to them, it is this : it will take a long time to complete survey and settlement operations. But has the Hon. Minister told us from where does he expect to get this money? And then, who computed this 12½ crores compensation; for during the discussion of the original Bill, I think, it was said in the other House that the compensation would amount to less than nine and a half crores.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I think the hon. Member has sufficiently stressed this point. He may proceed to his next point.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ So, I say Sir, the real reason for this Bill is something else, and the reason mentioned in the statement of Objects and Reasons is intended to cover up that reason. Sir, as per this Bill, one half of the compensation is to be deposited before the tribunal; Now, Sir, Government have entered into a pact with the zamindars to pay them 12½ crores.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ In the original Act also there is provision made for interim payment.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Yes, Sir; but nowhere is it stated that 12½ crores should be paid, of which 6½ crores should be paid in cash. I say it is an unholy pact Government have formed with the zamindars behind this legislature. The Hon. Minister for Revenue has been unable to say wherefrom he expects to find this money. Are Government going to dip into the revenue reserve fund? Sir, when they are unable to find money for Grow More Food, for irrigation works, for sinking wells, for supplying electricity to ryots, for so many public health activities, are they justified in dipping into revenue reserve fund? Let them not do as they like? I say, Sir, it would be a crowning misfortune for this Province if this Bill were to be passed; and this Government will get into the greatest disrepute. So I tell them, let them consider once, twice and thrice before passing this Bill and putting it into operation. This is a piece of legislation most injurious to the Province and is inconsistent with the principle of the original Act, as is evident from the statement of Objects and Reasons. Never in the history of any legislature has a measure been brought of this sort and rushed through. So I protest against this Bill and I oppose it to the best of my ability with all the emphasis at my command.”

10th January 1950]

* THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I am indeed thankful to the Leader of the Opposition for giving this advice as to what will happen to us in the future, if we pass this legislation. Sir, we know how to take care of our future; let the Leader of the Opposition take care of his own future. (Laughter.) Sir, he was harping on the 12½ crores and was asking how this was arrived at and so on. I have got with me the official report of the Madras Legislative Council, dated Monday, the 22nd November 1948, wherein it will be seen that Mr. Kala Venkata Rao, my predecessor in office has said this on the floor of this House—

‘ We would satisfy our feelings of justice and equity in respect of this matter and therefore we have arrived at the figure of 12½ crores as compensation to be paid to the zamindars.’

So, Sir, this is nothing new, and so none of the hon. Members on the opposite side need get excited as though suddenly the Revenue Minister is throwing away 12½ crores just to satisfy somebody. I have read out to the House what my predecessor in office has said on the floor of this House, and so I hope there will not be any more controversy about it.

“ Then, Sir, the question was asked, ‘ what will happen to those people who have no money to do this, to do that and so on?’ And we were accused of throwing good money and all that sort of thing. Sir, I have already said in my opening remarks that in this piece of legislation we propose to give zamindars a certain portion of compensation, and then after the survey and settlement operations are over, if it is found that there is something more to be paid to them as compensation, it will be paid to them. Sir, at first it was thought that it was unnecessary to bring this legislation. We examined the question whether we could get this done under the rules framed under section 40, and it was found that it would be not correct, and so we were advised by legal advisers that it is necessary to bring in an amending Bill. Hence it is that this Bill has been necessitated and brought forward. Then, Sir, Dr. John asked, ‘ did not this Government know before about the delay likely to be caused in the matter of survey and settlement operations, and why should they not have provided for this advance payment in the original Bill?’ Sir, when the Bill was brought forward, people said that it was an expropriatory Bill, and now when we bring this Bill to pay compensation, those very hon. Members try to out-Herod Herod and speak in terms more than our socialist friends. I hope they practice it in the lives and not merely speak of it in this House! ”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Is it in order, Sir, for an Hon. Minister to cast personal remarks against an hon. Member that he should practise in life what he says here? ”

* THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—“ I am very happy to hear that he practises. (Laughter.) Sir, I have already explained there is nothing particularly strange or revolutionary

[Sri H. Sitarama Reddi] [10th January 1950]

or something new in the provisions of this Bill, and so I request the Bill may be taken into consideration at once."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

' that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Legislative Assembly be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was declared lost as the ' Ayes ' were negligible and ' Noes ' were very prominent.

[At this stage Sri S. B. Adityan entered the Council Chamber and took his seat.]

MR. PRESIDENT (After a pause) :—" Do you want a poll? I don't think so much time is required to say that."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" Evidently, Government are not sure of their strength, and that is why they are taking such a long time to make up their mind."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" May I know the ruling of the Chair? "

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member was absent and I am not here to repeat my ruling after I have given it once, whenever the hon. Member wants."

DR. P. S. SRINIVASAN :—" I demand a poll."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The question is—

' that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Legislative Assembly be taken into consideration at once.' "

[The Hon. Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria entered the Chamber and took his seat after the question was put.]

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I think the Hon. Minister has to keep out."

[The Hon. Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria left the Chamber.]

The motion was put and carried.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member Dr. John has given notice of an amendment to this clause."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Sir, we have decided not to take further part in the discussion of this Bill. But in deference to the Chair, we are not walking out. I do not propose to move any amendment or take further part in connexion with this Bill."

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—" Sir, I move—

' that the Bill be passed into law.'

10th January 1950] [Sri H. Sitarama Reddi]

"I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition found it necessary to take the attitude that he took. As I have already explained, the Government do not mean to take away the privileges of any of the Members of this House including the Opposition. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will not mind what has happened. I hope that he has taken up his present attitude not as a protest against the provisions of the Bill but perhaps because he felt hurt that adequate time was not given."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—"Both."

THE HON. SRI H. SITARAMA REDDI :—"I take it that so far as the provisions of this Bill are concerned, he is thoroughly satisfied."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—"No."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"The question is—

'that the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), be passed into law.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. PRESIDENT :—"I am very sorry to remark that whatever the other faults of the Government might be, I for my part am not satisfied with the way in which the Government and the other Members of their party attended to the work that was going on in this House especially when the Opposition was so strongly objecting to the motion. I would have been perfectly justified in declaring the motion lost, adjourning the House and walking out. Because I knew that the Members did not anticipate such a situation and in deference to the importance of the subject, I waited for some time. I was surprised that even the Whips were not present and nobody challenged my decision immediately. I have been telling the Government more than once that if sufficient voices are not raised on their side, I would have no compunction to decide against their motion. I hope the Government will take a lesson from this. Especially when the Leader of the Opposition was so vehement, I expected the Whips to be vigilant and the Members to be in their places. (Sir S. B. Adityan rose to speak.) I do not want any discussion on this matter. I am mentioning this for future guidance, and I hope that such things will not take place in future."

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 20th January 1950.

V.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

The Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Amendment Bill, 1949 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly and received therefrom in the Council.